

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HERMAN TAMRAT,
Plaintiff,

v.

S. RIED, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [20-cv-01324-PJH](#)

ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 38

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, proceeds with a pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendant Reid filed a motion for summary judgment and plaintiff filed an opposition. Plaintiff now seeks an extension to file an additional opposition once he receives certain discovery. He also includes his discovery requests that were presumably sent to defendant.

Plaintiff is advised that the court generally is not involved in the discovery process and only becomes involved when there is a dispute between the parties about discovery responses. Discovery requests and responses normally are exchanged between the parties without any copy sent to the court. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d) (listing discovery requests and responses that “must not” be filed with the court until they are used in the proceeding or the court orders otherwise). Only when the parties have a discovery dispute that they cannot resolve among themselves should the parties even consider asking the court to intervene in the discovery process. The court does not have the resources to oversee all discovery, and so requires that the parties present to it only their very specific disagreements. To promote the goal of addressing only very specific disagreements (rather than becoming an overseer of all discovery), the court requires

1 that the parties meet and confer to try to resolve their disagreements before seeking
2 court intervention. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a); N.D. Cal. Local Rule 37.

3 The motion (Docket No. 38) is **GRANTED** in part. Plaintiff may file an additional
4 opposition to the motion for summary judgment by **June 11, 2021**. If plaintiff objects to
5 the discovery responses from defendant, he must file a motion to compel and describe
6 which specific discovery requests he seeks to compel, why defendant's responses are
7 insufficient and why he is entitled to the discovery. The court notes that many of
8 plaintiff's discovery requests are not relevant to the claims in this action.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: May 11, 2021

11
12 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

13 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28